

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/751,272	01/02/2004	Marcus L. Murphy	4362-113	7482
20792 75	590 . 12/03/2004		EXAMINER	
MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC			BROWN, PETER R	
PO BOX 37428 RALEIGH, NC 27627		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
10.22.01,			3636	
			DATE MAILED: 12/03/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· ·		,				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/751,272	MURPHY, MARCUS L.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Peter R. Brown	3636				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 Se	eptember 2004.					
·= · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar		osecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.	,					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3,5,12-15 and 18-21</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) 4,6-11,16,17 and 22-29 is/are objecte						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r					
0) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	* * *	, ,				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		, ,				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(a))-(d) or (f).				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		on No.				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	• •					
application from the International Bureau	•	Ç				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not receive	ed.				
•						
Attachment(s)						
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Delice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5)	atent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 3636

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the stop formed by a step in the base plate, as set forth in claims 6,17 and 24 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Art Unit: 3636

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

There is no definite antecedent basis for "the first connector piece".

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Berning.

Figures 1 and 2 show structure as claimed, wherein reclining units may be secured together by two components such that the connection prevents relative horizontal movement but allows relative vertical movement.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stephan.

Figures 4 and 5 show a connecting structure between two seat members wherein relative horizontal movement is prevented but relative vertical movement is allowed. Note that the interconnecting structure is configured such that it "permits" interconnection of the two chair units when the two units are brought together via a relative horizontal movement.

Art Unit: 3636

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers in view of Hardee.

Rogers (figs. 1-6) shows structure similar to that claimed, including a striker bar or "post" 13 on one component that is engaged in a slot 30 in another component, wherein a locking finger 18 is provided to rotate to lock the post within the slot. A biasing spring 34 is provided to bias the finger towards the engagement position. While the post is not movable in a longitudinal direction, the patent to Hardee (figs. 1-3) teaches the mounting of a striker member 30 by means of both a pivotal or horizontal movement via slot 32, wherein the user has a choice of two unlocking movements. In view of this suggestion, to have mounted the post 13 of the latching mechanism of Rogers such that it may be disengaged from the slot by a movement along its axis, would have been an obvious modification to one with ordinary skill in the art, thereby providing more versatility for user.

Claims 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephan in view of Berning.

Art Unit: 3636

As set forth above, Stephan show interconnecting structure as claimed. To have utilized the interconnecting structure of Stephan between two recliner chairs, as suggested by Berning, would have been an obvious modification to one with ordinary skill in the art, as would the mounting of the interconnecting components to the base of the reclining mechanism.

Claims 4-11, 16,17, and 22-29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ware et al, Ballendat et al, Schultz et al, Saul et al, Eppelt and LaPointe et al show various features of the invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter R. Brown whose telephone number is 703-308-2103. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3636

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3636

prb